

## SPEECH

OF

# HON. W. D. KELLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 7, 1866.

The House, as in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having under consideration the bill (H. R. No. 337) regulating trade with the British North American possessions—

Mr. KELLEY said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I had made my remarks yesterday afternoon, I should have added another to the many illustrations I have given this session of the mistake made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WENTWORTH] when he said I never took less than an hour when I got the floor, for I am quite sure that twenty minutes would then have sufficed me. But I have had a night in which to examine the provisions of this bill and to reflect upon them, and I shall probably ask the attention of the House for a longer period this morning.

I would have been satisfied yesterday with the amendment proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. F. THOMAS] coupled with one or two others. To-day, however, this will not satisfy me. Sir, the bill should be rejected. It is false in principle and in detail, and will materially diminish the revenues of the country by suspending several important branches of our industry. As I conned its sections I became doubtful of its origin; whether it was of British or American conception. There are many of its features which constrain me to think that it is of foreign and not of American origin. I point gentlemen to the ninth section. Its authors seem to have been oblivious to the fact that we are still living under democratic-republican institutions, and have not yet fallen under a dictatorship.

The ninth section confides the regulation of all the commerce that may grow up between the United States and the British Provinces to the absolute and unrestricted control of the President. Let me astound gentlemen who have not examined the bill by reading that portion of the section to which I refer:

SEC. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That the President is hereby authorized to terminate or suspend the provisions of this act, or any section or sections thereof, and as to the whole or part of the British North American colonies, by giving public notice of such termination or suspension, whenever in his opinion it may appear just and proper, &c.

Sir, such power may be exercised by the Emperor of Russia in regard to the commerce of his empire; but such power, regulating the trade of this country according to his caprice, has never been confided to the President of the United States, or will be confided to one while the American people remain free.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KELLEY. I would rather not now. The gentleman knows my time is limited.

Mr. ROGERS. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] if this bill gives the President any more power than was proposed to be given to him by the Freedmen's Bureau bill?

Mr. KELLEY. I have no time for side issues now. I will answer that question some time when my distinguished friend has the floor and kindly yields to me. [Laughter.]

Sir, this bill is of a piece with others now pending before this House. It is like the loan bill, which proposes to contract the business of



the country to the narrow dimensions it filled before the war, and to give the Secretary of the Treasury, while he has an average balance of \$40,000,000 lying on deposit in the banks, the power to control the currency of the country, to contract or expand it as he will. It is also in this respect like the postal bill, which, as an inducement to the people to buy their envelopes from Government employés or contractors, proposes to give one free of cost to every man who buys a postage stamp.

Sir, when I regard this feature of the bill, I feel that its paternity may have been American, that it may have emanated from the Administration. But when I consider its provisions in reference to trade, and see how well they are calculated to prostrate many of the leading interests of the country; the advantages it secures to foreign commodities which compete with the productions of our laboring people; how it stimulates the development of the resources of the British Provinces, and induces emigration to them, while it restricts the development of our resources, and is calculated to divert immigration from our shores; when I see all this, I say, I feel that the Canadian ministry must have concocted this bill.

Mr. CONKLING. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] a question pertinent to what he is now saying.

Mr. KELLEY. I would rather not yield now, having just declined to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. ROGERS.]

I know, Mr. Chairman, how hard it is to break away from habit, to escape from established usage; and I remember that for more than ten years, under the fraudulently named reciprocity treaty, we have had our habits, usages, and modes of thought controlled by the infamous provisions of that treaty; and it may be that their influence has controlled the committee that presented this bill. But, sir, nothing is more certain than that had we never had that treaty we never would have had this bill; it is its legitimate offspring, and embodies many of the worst vices of its parent.

Sir, what was that treaty? It was conceived in iniquity and executed in sin. It was one of the master-strokes of policy of the sagacious and recklessly ambitious men who had even then determined to destroy our country. Its object

was to enfeeble and impoverish the North, and to strengthen the Provinces of our most powerful enemy, that bound the whole line of our northern frontier. It was the result of a deliberate conspiracy, the first object of which was to give the American market to foreign manufacturers, by destroying every leading branch of American manufactures; and the second was, when they had attained the first, to prostrate the grain-growers and provision-producers of the West and North, and thus reduce the impoverished North to subjection to the slaveholding oligarchy of the South. Its ultimate purpose was to produce bankruptcy and discord in the North, that they might more easily accomplish their then purpose, which they expressed by open action in April, 1861.

In order that gentlemen may see that I speak by the record, I send to the Clerk's desk a volume bearing the imprint of Prichard, Abbott, & Loomis, Augusta, Georgia, 1860, and entitled "Cotton is King, and Pro-Slavery Arguments, comprising the Writings of Hammond, Harper, Christie, Stringfellow, Hodge, Bledsoe, and Cartwright, on this Important Subject, by E. N. Elliott, LL. D., president of Planters' College, Mississippi, with an Essay on Slavery in the Light of International Law, by the Editor."

Let one of these distinguished men inform the country whether I am correct in what I now say.

The Clerk read, as follows:

"Thus also was a tripartite alliance formed by which the western farmer, the southern planter, and the English manufacturer became united in a common bond of interest, the whole giving their support to the doctrine of free trade.

"This active commerce between the West and South soon caused a rivalry in the East, that pushed forward improvements by States or corporations, to gain a share in the western trade. These improvements, as completed, gave to the West a choice of markets, so that its farmers could elect whether to feed the slave who grows the cotton or the operatives who are engaged in its manufacture. But this rivalry did more. The competition for western products enhanced their price and stimulated their more extended cultivation. This required an enlargement of the markets, and the extension of slavery became essential to western prosperity.

"We have not reached the end of the alliance between the western farmer and southern planter. The emigration which has been filling Iowa and Minnesota, and is now rolling like a flood into Kansas and Nebraska, is but a repetition of what has occurred in the other western States and Territories. Agricultural pursuits are highly remunerative; and tens of thousands of men of moderate means or of no means are cheered along to where none forbids them land to till.

"For the last few years public improvements have



called for vastly more than the usual share of labor and augmented the consumption of provisions. The foreign demand added to this has increased their price beyond what the planter can afford to pay. For many years free labor and slave labor maintained an even race in their western progress. Of late the freemen have begun to lag behind, while slavery has advanced by several degrees of longitude. Free labor must be made to keep pace with it. There is an urgent necessity for this. The demand for cotton is increasing in a ratio greater than can be supplied by the American planters, unless by a corresponding increased production. This increasing demand must be met, or its cultivation will be facilitated elsewhere, and the monopoly of the planter in the European markets be interrupted. This can only be effected by concentrating the greatest possible number of slaves upon the cotton plantations. Hence they must be supplied with provisions.

"This is the present aspect of the provision question, as it regards slavery extension. Prices are approximating the maximum point, beyond which our provisions can be fed to slaves, unless there is a corresponding increase in the price of cotton. Such a result was not anticipated by southern statesmen when they had succeeded in overthrowing the protective policy, destroying the United States Bank, and establishing the sub-Treasury system. And why has this occurred? The mines of California prevented both the free-trade tariff (the tariff of 1846, under which our exports are now made, approximates the free-trade principles very closely) and the sub-Treasury scheme from exhausting the country of the precious metals, extinguishing the circulation of bank notes, and reducing the prices of agricultural products to the specie value. At the date of the passage of the Nebraska bill, the multiplication of provisions by their more extended cultivation was the only measure left that could produce a reduction of prices and meet the wants of the planters. The Canadian reciprocity treaty, since secured, will bring the products of the British North American colonies, free of duty, into competition with those of the United States when prices with us rule high, and tend to diminish their cost."

Mr. KELLEY: Mr. Chairman, as the bill before the House has, in my judgment, all the vices of that treaty, I shall propose the following as a substitute for it.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as follows:

That from and after the 17th of March, 1866, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all articles imported from her Britannic Majesty's possessions in North America, that is to say, from Canada, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Prince Edward's Island, and the several islands thereunto adjacent, Hudson's Bay Territory, British Columbia, and Vancouver's Island, the same duties and rates of duties which are now imposed by law on like articles imported from other foreign countries.

Mr. KELLEY. I am not prepared to say that my substitute contains all the provisions it should; that it may not be amended with advantage; but I do say that it is infinitely preferable, for every leading interest of the country, to the bill now under consideration.

Why should we have a special tariff law for the British Provinces? What have they done to win our love? Why should we sacrifice our interests to protect or advance theirs?

The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] said in the course of his remarks that

we should not base our action on hatred or fear. I do not propose to base any of my acts in this House upon any of the passions. I mean to be governed by cool judgment.

But, sir, I remember when we were in a death grapple with our insane brethren of the South, the people of these Provinces smote us first on one cheek and then on the other; and I know, sir, if we were prepared to forgive them seven times seventy, their transgressions against us had exceeded that number before they organized a raiding party and sent it into the gentleman's own State to rob the banks and murder the citizens who attempted to defend them. Backed as they are by the power of England, they are our most dangerous enemies, because they are our nearest; and I do not find it laid down even in the Christian code of morals that we shall injure ourselves and impoverish our families and country to benefit those who would have disseminated poison among us, who would have burned our cities and towns, and who did all that the devilish ingenuity of the madmen of the South could suggest to injure us and destroy our country.

They are foreigners to our soil, and let us regard them as we do the people of other countries, as friends in peace and enemies in war. Let us legislate for them, as the substitute I have submitted proposes to do, precisely as we do for the rest of mankind. I can understand, sir, in the light of the invaluable book from which I have had an extract read, why every provision of the so-called reciprocity treaty was adverse to our country. Both parties to it meant mischief to us. But I cannot understand why a bill should be reported by the Committee of Ways and Means which if adopted would inevitably strike down several of the principal or leading interests of our country. It might well be entitled a bill to destroy the fisheries, salt-works, and lumber trade of the country, and to prevent the working of bituminous coal-beds east of the summit of the Alleghanies and within the limits of the United States. Should it become a law it will ruin all those great branches of industry.

The gentleman from Vermont, in introducing the bill, said with great plausibility—more plausibility than candor, I am sorry to say:

"Coal is a raw material, and for every ton of iron



made at least three tons of bituminous or two of anthracite coal are consumed. It is the motive power of railroads and steamboats as well as of manufacturing establishments. We tax iron and all other manufactures when produced and sold, and we tax railroads and steamboats on their business. Can we not afford to have our coal free? It is, too, an article of universal consumption, required in our rigorous climate in large quantities by those unable to clothe themselves in heavy and abundant woollens or thick and costly furs; by the poor as well as the rich. There are hardly more reasons for a tax on coal than upon firewood. In addition to this, our own coal-fields are unsurpassed in extent and quality by any in the world.

"But our export to the Canadas of coal from Ohio, Virginia, and Pennsylvania bids fair to equal in amount all that we bring from the Provinces; the value of our exports in 1864 being \$555,332, and that of our imports \$883,805. So that under any circumstances here is one article which approaches the idea of reciprocity, and an interchange effects economy in long lines of freight, relieving ourselves as well as others from positive loss."

Carlyle tells us that nothing lies like figures, although the general proposition is that figures never lie. I say, then, the statement made is as plausibly delusive as a statement each of the propositions of which is in itself true can be.

Sir, is chalk cheese, or cheese chalk? In speaking about bituminous and anthracite coal we speak of two distinct articles, as unlike as cheese and chalk. This bill does not in any way, or by any possibility, affect either advantageously or disadvantageously the anthracite coal trade and interests of the country.

Canada must have our anthracite coal. She has none of it, nor can she obtain it elsewhere. Our Pennsylvania anthracite coal-fields are a God-given monopoly, as are the long-staple cotton-fields of the South. Our anthracite interest asks no protection so far as Canada is concerned. Were it constitutional to impose an export duty you might put a light one on anthracite coal, and the Canadas would still buy it from us. The \$555,332, worth of coal exported under the treaty in 1864 was anthracite, and in fact, therefore, has no part in a discussion relating as this does to the bituminous coal interests of the country. The article bears the name of coal, and there is no other reason why it should be named in connection with this bill.

From what fields, and to what provincial ports, have we exported bituminous coal from Ohio? I ask the well-informed gentlemen who compose the Ohio delegation to tell me if there be one line of steamers, or any other kind of boats, employed in carrying Ohio coal to the British Provinces. Why, sir, they could

not sell it at the wharf in any provincial town for its cost. Virginia coal go to the British Provinces! It cannot, in the nature of things, have gone there save as a curiosity for mineralogical cabinets. It never went there as an article of commerce.

The gist of the gentleman's argument is that we need cheap coal. Why, then, does he not propose to take the duty of a dollar and a quarter per ton off British coal, so that we may have it still cheaper? Where is his logic?

Mr. MORRILL. Does the gentleman desire an answer?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Chairman, in relation to this subject of coal, I confess that I am not clear that it is proper to protect it at all. I do believe that it is one of those articles that cannot be increased by protection, and if it is so, the whole foundation of the doctrine drops out, in my judgment. I think, as I stated in the extracts which the gentleman has just read, that it is so nearly allied to firewood that it deserves perhaps no protection.

And while I am up allow me to ask the gentleman if he has any statistics to show that this coal that goes to Canada is not bituminous coal. Do they not use it there for the purpose of making gas? Or do they use anthracite coal throughout the Provinces for making gas? I ask for information.

Mr. KELLEY. I will answer the question of the gentleman. There may have some small quantity of Ohio coal gone there for experiment in gas making, or occasionally a vessel may have carried it as ballast to some western town. It is not a recognized article of commerce, and there is neither an organized company for the sale or carrying of bituminous coal from Ohio, Virginia, or Pennsylvania, to the Canadas. I admit that there may be special cargoes shipped for gas companies in some extreme western parts of Canada, but that does not touch the argument. But while I admit the fact, for the argument's sake, I must say that I do not believe it, for I do not see how it can be true.

The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] says the quantity of coal cannot be increased. Allow me to say that I am speaking for no Pennsylvania interest to-day. I am speaking for poor, wasted, war-trampled Vir-



ginia, for Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, for Georgia, and all the southern States. They all need our fostering care, and all have inexhaustible beds of bituminous coal that ought to be productive. I am not willing that the rebellious people of the South shall become my political master or equal in the councils of the nation until they are politically regenerated. But I desire to develop their natural resources, to induce capitalists, laborers, and men of enterprise to go and settle among them, and build up industrious and peaceful Commonwealths in the hearts of whose people loyalty to the Union shall dwell. It is in these interests that I speak. The bituminous coal interest of eastern Pennsylvania is comparatively unimportant; but we have the only paying bituminous coal company east of the summit of the Alleghany mountains. Thirty-odd millions of capital have already been invested outside of my State in this branch of the coal trade. Thirty millions more have been invested in railroads to convey the coal from the mines to market, and though it is all unproductive, or nearly so, the owners do not abandon it as lost.

They hope that, impelled by a sense of justice, or the pride of American citizenship, Congress will protect them against the assaults of British capital and ill-paid labor. They have waited in hope for the day when the infamous treaty which blasted their prospects should be annulled and they be permitted to enjoy equal chances with foreigners in our own markets. Give them but an even chance, burdened as they are by our war taxes, and all these dead millions will become productive. I challenge any member of the House to name another bituminous coal company than the Westmoreland Company that has paid or earned a dividend in the last three years on the eastern slope of the mountains. Give them protection equal to the taxes, direct and incidental, which you impose upon them, and you will find that instead of the product of 1867 being but two million tons, as it was last year, we can produce ninety-five million tons, as England did in that same year. Our fields are broader and richer than hers and those of Nova Scotia combined. They are scattered from the mountain above the clouds, on the brows of which

Hooker and his brave comrades fought, eastward and northward and westward all over our country. Give them but that measure of protection which under the weight of taxation they bear will secure an equal chance in our markets, and they will give you an adequate supply of coal, and in two or three years domestic competition, while it will by patronizing your railroads and carrying companies have filled your Treasury and enabled you to reduce your scale of taxation, will bring down the price of coal in all our markets.

Pennsylvania, I repeat, has no special interest in this question. Her interest is that the general prosperity of the country shall be promoted. We want you manufacturers of New England to clothe the men who dig and handle our coal; we want you men of the Northwest to feed the men who dig and handle our coal; and Pennsylvania will rejoice in her share of the general prosperity which will then bless our country.

Sir, I turn to the fortieth page of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, embodying the report of the revenue commissioners, and find that in the fiscal year 1865 there were imported, under the reciprocity treaty, 13,025,432 bushels, being 465,194 tons of bituminous coal, free of duty, from the British Provinces. There were imported in the same year, paying a duty of \$1 25 a ton, 6,131,608 bushels, being 218,986 tons, from England. There were exported of domestic production, which, as I have said, was all or nearly all anthracite, 3,708,264 bushels, and there were exported of foreign production 25,536 bushels, making nearly 1,000 tons.

Sir, will it be said that the vast coal-beds of this country cannot supply our wants, and that we cannot increase our production? Or will any gentleman say that a duty of fifty cents is enough to protect these embarrassed but important interests? I ask gentlemen to mark the fact, that though 465,194 tons came in under the reciprocity treaty, free of duty, from her Provinces, England was still able to send in, and pay \$1 25 duty per ton, the enormous amount of 218,986 tons. Is it not apparent from these facts that we will bankrupt every bituminous coal company in the country if we pass this bill?

Do gentlemen say our demands in this behalf are exorbitant, or ask why our coal can-



not be sold cheaply as that of England and the Provinces? I answer them in part by another question, which is, do they wish the American miner to toil for the wages given to laborers in English collieries? Sir, the heartlessness of the capitalists of England was never more fully exposed than by the report of the parliamentary commission appointed to inquire into the condition of the mining population of the country. England's shame is nowhere written in broader or darker colors than in that report, and I will not permit myself to believe that any member of this House is anxious that we should emulate that page of her history.

Our better wages for labor and our heavy war taxes answer the suggestion thrown out. How much England and her American Provinces did to protract and aggravate the war is known to all, and I am not willing they should derive advantage from their treachery. On this subject I quote a few lines from a letter from an intelligent coal operator :

"It is almost impossible to compute precisely the amount of revenue that Government reaps from a ton of bituminous coal, but the fairest way to get at it will be to take the cost of putting the article on board vessel before the war, (or in 1860.) \$3 50 per ton, as compared with the present cost, seven dollars per ton, making an increase in the actual cost of \$3 50 per ton. This increase is in the main occasioned by the taxes which have been levied in order to support the Government, (which we pay cheerfully;) and they touch every article of provisions and repairs about the mines and railroads, as well as the two and a half per cent. upon the gross rate of transportation and five per cent. upon the net earnings of the carrying companies, which, when all summed together, amount to very nearly if not quite three dollars per ton."

Sir, we are in a transition age; and here I reply to the remark of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] that coal ought not to be protected. We are in a transition age in more senses than one. We are passing from war to peace and from the age of iron to the age of steel. In a few years, if we foster our industry, steel will supplant iron in almost all the uses to which it is now applied. Sir, coal and iron are the muscles of modern civilization; and fire—ignited coal—is the material force that is impelling us onward and upward. Had the southern States had equal mastery with us of these elements, I doubt whether we would yet have made conquest over them. I query whether the result might not have been otherwise than it was. What were Vulcan and the Cyclops to an American mechanic handling a steam-engine or a

trip-hammer? We live in a new age. Old mythologies and traditions serve but to hamper us. We must adapt ourselves to the agencies by which we are surrounded and the exigencies in which we are involved.

Sir, when the consular wreath first graced the brow of Napoleon he had only conquered Italy, which, in the somewhat boastful language of the historian, extended "from the Alps to the Papal dominions." And what had he done? Why, sir, all that Italy which he had conquered, could it be lifted bodily, could be set down comfortably within the limits of the State of Maine or of South Carolina. He had never then commanded so many men as Burnside marched through the city of Washington when taking his single corps to swell the grand army of Lieutenant General Grant in the Wilderness. How was it that we could move such masses of men, fight this war over the broadest theater of international or civil war known to history, and conclude it in little more than four years? It was because we used coal and iron as our muscles, and fire—ignited coal—as our force. These gave us New Orleans, and battered down Fort Fisher.

And I may add that, had there been a well-stocked railroad from Moscow to the Rhine, Napoleon's retreat would have been marked by fewer horrors, and the history of the nineteenth century would not probably have read as it does.

And if the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means desires to secure us a respectable position among the nations, he will not strike down, disparage, or neglect the coal and iron interests of the country, to subserve any interest of his own, his State, or section. They are the primordial elements of our greatness, and should be cherished above all others. Look at their power. Behold a woman with an iron machine before her moving noiselessly; it is impelled by coal and iron fashioned into an engine, and is doing more work in one day than one hundred such women could have done in a week one century ago. Or see yonder pallid little girl attending such a machine; she will produce results in one day that would have taxed the industry of her grandmother for a year. The power of those delicate people is not superhuman; it is coal and iron that produce these more than magical results.



The gentleman doubts whether the production of coal can or should be stimulated, and is willing we should depend on our most powerful and our nearest enemies for this elemental substance. The country will not respond to such purblind patriotism. And the passage of this bill will reduce us to such abject dependence.

In eleven months of 1865—I do not go back to 1864, but take the first eleven months of 1865, of last year—sixty-six per cent. of the bituminous coal consumed in the States east of Pennsylvania was mined by the laborers of Britain or of the British Provinces. Let me prove this. The amount of bituminous coal received at Boston and New York from the British Provinces, free of duty, to the 1st of December, 1865, was 392,158 tons. The amount of English coal received at the same points during the same period, which paid a tax of \$1 25 per ton, was 103,723; total foreign coal, 495,891 tons. The amount of coal produced in the United States, delivered during the same period at the same points, was but 287,874 tons; balance in favor of foreign coal, 208,874 tons—one coal company in the British Provinces declaring dividends of one hundred and seventy-five per cent. in a year, and but one of the hundreds of companies in our country able to declare a dividend of one per cent., making a contrast so unfavorable to us that many of our enterprising people, as was shown yesterday by the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. F. THOMAS,] abandoned their country and embarked their capital in the coal regions of Nova Scotia. Can we strengthen our country by exporting enterprise, industry, and capital?

And is it not marvelous that such an exhibit against us can be made, in view of the facts that our bituminous coal-fields are so much broader and richer than those of England and Nova Scotia combined, and that we depend for the support of our Government and its credit upon taxes derived in great part from the forge, the furnace, the foundery, the railroad, the machine shop, the coal-bed, and iron mines? Are gentlemen willing to perpetuate the malign influence that has produced a state of facts so disparaging to our intelligence, patriotism, and interests? No; I believe they will agree with me that the time has arrived when we should develop our own resources, foster American

labor, and guard our own interests. One effect of the reciprocity treaty has been to send to Canada one million five hundred thousand immigrants who, but for the advantages it gave the Provinces over us, would have swelled our population. Let us now, by taking care of our own people, induce them to come and share our burdens and blessings.

Sir, I have said that I would not legislate with reference to the Provinces under the influence of fear or hate. It would indeed be unwise, for these people will yet be our countrymen. When British free trade, preventing, as it ever does to the people of British Provinces, the diversification of their industry, shall have impoverished their soil and repelled immigration from their shores; when that system of British free trade which keeps those upon whom it is inflicted at hard labor in the production of white crops, has impoverished their fields as it has those of our old States, and reduced them to oft-recurring bankruptcy, as it inevitably must; and when adequate protection to our labor shall have developed our boundless resources, and generous wages invited to our shores the skilled laborers of the world, the contrast between our condition and that of the people of the Provinces will impel them to unite their destiny with ours, and then I shall, or my posterity will, be ready to greet them cordially as compatriots.

Sir, what do we get in return for the immeasurable degradation proposed by this bill? Why, sir, we get the right to navigate the St. Lawrence and to patronize the canals and railroads of Canada, and the right to cut lumber—mark you, “the right to cut lumber or timber of any kind on that portion of the American territory in the State of Maine watered by the river St. John and its tributaries, and when floated down that river to the sea to ship the same to the United States from the Province of New Brunswick without any export duty or other duty.” I take it, sir, that these rights will not be long withheld from us, even if we determine to give the American laborer a fair field in which to compete with those of England and her Provinces.

Let me pause for a moment to say to the gentleman that his statement of the amount of coal imported and exported is more plausible than candid in a respect not yet noticed. It is ap-

praised at *ad valorem* prices, which are specie prices in the land from which it is exported; while ours is calculated at currency prices. This fact must be borne in mind in making the calculations of relative quantities.

But to resume and conclude. Sir, to get these rights we give precisely the same rights in larger degree and with greater advantage to the British colonists. We will therefore get them without this bill. I do not wish to acquire them by force. I am anxious to see them granted reciprocally by our country and the Provinces; but not as this bill does it.

It can be done by treaty or by act of Congress; but be that as it may, do not let us agree to destroy the fisheries of New England, the salt-works of West Virginia, the lumber business of the Northwest and of Maine, and the bituminous coal-works of the whole country, as the price of the privilege of yielding more specifically and in kind than we get.

No, sir; let us maintain our rights, our interests, and our country's dignity. Let us go on our way as though there were no British Provinces; and the mere action of British legislation, constraining their people, as I have already said, to unrequited agricultural labor, will make them sigh for our prosperity. And then we shall find that the American Constitution is as elastic as it is grand and enduring. It has expanded to embrace immense tracts of territory. Our flag has swept from the limits of the original thirteen States to the Pacific, and southward to the Rio Grande; and, sir, when the people of Canada shall, as they will if we protect our labor, ask to unite their destinies with ours, the world will receive additional proof that when Providence impelled our fathers to the creation of our Government, it gave them the wisdom to bless us with a Constitution which is the fit canopy of a continent, and will yet crown one.